

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

In response to the office action, Claims 7-8, 15, 16, 22, 23, 30, 31, 37, 38, 45, and 46 were cancelled without prejudice, Claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 10, 11, 17, 26, 32, 33, 36, 40, 41, and 42 were amended, Claims 18, 21, 25, and 27 were unchanged.

**Rejection of Claims 1-2, 5-6, 8, 10, 11, 16, 17, 32-34, 38, 40-42, and 46 under 35 USC 112, second paragraph:**

In view of the Examiner's rejection of the claims as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention, the terminology "is adapted to/being adapted to/adapted to or adapted for" have been replaced with more definite terms where appropriate throughout the claims.

**Rejection of Claims 1-2, 5-8, 10-11, 15-18, 21-23, 25-27, 30-33, 36-38, 40-42, 45-46 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Trompower et al (US 6,275,477) in view of Lee (US 6,535,493):**

The rejection of Claims 7-8, 10, 15, 16, 22, 23, 30, 31, 37, 38, and 45-46 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Trompower et al (US 6,275,477) in view of Lee (US 6,535,493) is moot in view of the cancellation of such claims.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejection of Claims 1-2, 5-6, 17, 18, 21, 25-27, 32, 33, 36, and 40-42 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Trompower et al (US 6,275,477) in view of Lee (US 6,535,493) as herein amended.

In contrast to Applicant's claimed invention, Trompower provides for mobility of proprietary devices and the mobility is only understood by the proprietary base stations. Any standards-based devices on the same network segment do not understand the mobility and thus cannot directly contact the mobile pagers. In Applicants' claimed invention, a system and method of using a standard protocol to accomplish a similar goal in a way that the standards-

based devices (IP routers, servers, etc.) can maintain direct communication with the mobile devices.

Independent Claims 1, 11, 17, 26, 32, 41, have been amended to clarify that the plurality of access points are all “within the same broadcast network” update their address resolution protocol cache to reflect the affiliation of the wireless user terminal. Support for this amendment can be found for example, in paragraph [0033] of Applicant’s original specification in which the access points (e.g., access points 104, 106 and 108) are within an IP subnet in the same broadcast domain. Applicants respectfully submit that Trompower et al (US 6,275,477) in view of Lee (US 6,535,493) taken singly or in combination do not anticipate the access points being all within the same broadcast network. Specifically, in the Lee patent, the address resolution protocol is used to allow an access point to operate as a proxy of a user terminal when that user terminal **moves to another subnet or, in other words, a different broadcast domain**.

Independent Claims 1, 17, and 32 have further been amended to include the limitations of “at least one of a media server, DNS server and an IP gateway router, each including a respective an address resolution protocol cache for storing information representative of affiliation between said user terminals and said access points and is updateable based on said address resolution protocol request.” Support for this amendment can be found in claim 8 of Applicants’ original specification. As the examiner points out in the office action on page 4, this limitation is not taught within the Trompower reference. Further, Applicants respectfully submit that Lee does not anticipate such limitations.

Independent Claims 11, 26, and 41 have been amended to clarify that the wireless transceiver of the access point transmits and receives data packets to and from a wireless user terminal affiliated with the access point “when said user terminal is participating in an ad-hoc network.” Support for this amendment can be found in paragraph [0018] of Applicants’ original specification. Applicants respectfully submit that Trompower et al (US 6,275,477) in view of Lee (US 6,535,493) taken singly or in combination do not anticipate participation in an ad-hoc network.

Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1, 11, 17, 26, 32, and 41 are in proper condition for allowance and request that claims 1, 11, 17, 26, 32, and 41 may now be passed to allowance.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejection of 2, 5-6, 18, 21, 25,27, 33, 36, 40, and 42 as herein amended. Claims 2, 5-6, 18, 21, 25,27, 33, 36, 40, and 42 contains further limitations of the now believed to be allowable amended claims 1, 11, 17, 26, 32, and 41 as discussed hereinabove. Applicants respectfully submit that claims 2, 5-6, 18, 21, 25,27, 33, 36, 40, and 42 are in proper condition for allowance and request that claims 2, 5-6, 18, 21, 25,27, 33, 36, 40, and 42 may now be passed to allowance.

For the foregoing reasons, applicants respectfully request that the above rejections be withdrawn.

Inasmuch as this amendment distinguishes all of the applicants' claims over the prior art references, for the many reasons indicated above, passing of this case is now believed to be in order. A Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

No amendment made was related to the statutory requirements of patentability unless expressly stated herein. No amendment made was for the purpose of narrowing the scope of any claim, unless applicant has argued herein that such amendment was made to distinguish over a particular reference or combination of references.

If the Examiner believes that there are any informalities which can be corrected by Examiner's amendment, or in the event that the Examiner deems the present application non-allowable, a telephone call to the undersigned at (954) 723-6449 is respectfully solicited.

Authorization is hereby given to charge any fees, or credit overpayment necessitated by actions taken herein to Deposit Account 50-2117.

Respectfully submitted,

October 28, 2006

Customer Number: 24273

By: /Randi L. Karpinia/  
Randi L. Karpinia  
Attorney of Record  
Reg. No.: 46,148  
Telephone: 954-723-6449  
Fax No.: 954-723-3871  
Email: **docketing.florida@motorola.com**